

REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND  
DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO PROVIDE TO  
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN DOCUMENTS IN  
THEIR POSSESSION RELATING TO THE WHITE HOUSE IRAQ  
GROUP

---

---

MARKUP  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION  
ON  
**H. Res. 505**

---

NOVEMBER 9, 2005

---

**Serial No. 109-134**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: [http://www.house.gov/international\\_relations](http://www.house.gov/international_relations)

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
24-519PDF

WASHINGTON : 2006

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa                                      | TOM LANTOS, California                   |
| CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey,<br><i>Vice Chairman</i> | HOWARD L. BERMAN, California             |
| DAN BURTON, Indiana                                       | GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York               |
| ELTON GALLEGLY, California                                | ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American<br>Samoa |
| ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida                              | DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey              |
| DANA ROHRABACHER, California                              | ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey              |
| EDWARD R. ROYCE, California                               | SHERROD BROWN, Ohio                      |
| PETER T. KING, New York                                   | BRAD SHERMAN, California                 |
| STEVE CHABOT, Ohio  | ROBERT WEXLER, Florida                   |
| THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado                              | ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York                 |
| RON PAUL, Texas   | WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts       |
| DARRELL ISSA, California                                  | GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York               |
| JEFF FLAKE, Arizona                                       | BARBARA LEE, California                  |
| JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia                                    | JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York                 |
| MARK GREEN, Wisconsin                                     | EARL BLUMENAUER, Oregon                  |
| JERRY WELLER, Illinois                                    | SHELLEY BERKLEY, Nevada                  |
| MIKE PENCE, Indiana                                       | GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, California          |
| THADDEUS G. McCOTTER, Michigan                            | ADAM B. SCHIFF, California               |
| KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida                                 | DIANE E. WATSON, California              |
| JOE WILSON, South Carolina                                | ADAM SMITH, Washington                   |
| JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas                                    | BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota                |
| J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina                        | BEN CHANDLER, Kentucky                   |
| CONNIE MACK, Florida                                      | DENNIS A. CARDOZA, California            |
| JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska                                |  |
| MICHAEL McCaul, Texas                                     |  |
| TED POE, Texas  |  |

THOMAS E. MOONEY, Sr., *Staff Director/General Counsel*

ROBERT R. KING, *Democratic Staff Director*

DANIEL FREEMAN, *Counsel/Parliamentarian*

JEAN CARROLL, *Full Committee Hearing Coordinator*

## CONTENTS

---

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| MARKUP OF   |      |
| H. Res. 505, Requesting the President of the United States and directing<br>the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain<br>documents in their possession relating to the White House Iraq Group ..... | 2    |



**REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND  
DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO PROVIDE TO  
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN DOCUMENTS  
IN THEIR POSSESSION RELATING TO THE WHITE HOUSE  
IRAQ GROUP**

---

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2005**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:50 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry J. Hyde (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Chairman HYDE. The Committee will come to order. Pursuant to notice, I call up the resolution, H. Res. 505, requesting the President of the United States and directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to the White House Iraq Group for purposes of markup and move to report it adversely. Without objection, the resolution will be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

[The resolution follows:]

HRES 505 IH

109th CONGRESS

1st Session

**H. RES. 505**

Requesting the President of the United States and directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to the White House Iraq Group.

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**October 20, 2005**

Mr. KUCINICH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

**RESOLUTION**

Requesting the President of the United States and directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to the White House Iraq Group.

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States is requested and the Secretary of State is directed to provide to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution--

- (1) all documents from 2003 pertaining to the taskforce organized by Andrew Card, consisting of Karl Rove, Karen Hughes, Mary Matalin, Nicholas E. Calio, James R. Wilkinson, Condoleezza Rice, Stephen Hadley and I. Lewis Libby, known as the White House Iraq Group;
- (2) all drafts of all white papers on the topic of Iraq's nuclear threat assembled in 2003 by the White House Iraq Group; and
- (3) all documents, including notes from meetings, memos, telephone and electronic mail records, logs and calendars, and records of internal discussions in the possession of the President or the Secretary of State relating to the White House Iraq Group.

*END*

Chairman HYDE. I will make an opening statement, Mr. Lantos will, and then we will open the bill up for amendment and discussion.

Today, the Committee will consider a resolution of inquiry. Mr. Kucinich of Ohio introduced H. Res. 505, requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State to transmit all documents from 2003 pertaining to the task force organized by Andrew Card, consisting of Karl Rove, Karen Hughes, Mary Matalin, Nicolas Calio, James Wilkinson, Condoleezza Rice, Stephen Hadley, and I. Lewis Libby, known as the White House Iraq Group.

H. Res. 505 is this Committee's ninth resolution of inquiry. Chief of Staff Andrew Card formed the White House Iraq Group in August 2002 to set strategy for each stage of the confrontation with Baghdad. The request for White House documents comes in the midst of numerous and extensive investigations into prewar intelligence on Iraq. Please bear with me while I summarize a sample of these investigations.

The two congressional Select Committees on Intelligence, the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, known as the Silberman-Robb Commission; the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee; and the British Hutton Inquiry all reviewed, in detail, issues of prewar intelligence on Iraq, and none found any evidence of Administration officials attempting to coerce, influence, or pressure intelligence analysts.

The Senate and House Permanent Select Committees on Intelligence reviewed, and continues to review, prewar intelligence on Iraq. Both Committees, while finding failures in our intelligence assessments and methods, found no evidence that the Administration fixed intelligence to justify its policies. For instance, Conclusion No. 83 in the Senate Intelligence Committee report, entitled "U.S. Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq," states:

"The Committee did not find any evidence that Administration officials attempted to coerce, influence, or pressure analysts to change their judgments related to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities."

This conclusion, as is true of the entire report, was approved by a unanimous bipartisan vote by the Senate Committee. The Senate's report, which runs over 500 pages, is the product of over 12 months of Committee review of more than 45,000 pages of intelligence documents spanning a decade and consisting of interviews of more than 200 individuals, including White House staff and documents from four Committee hearings.

The scope of the Senate Intelligence Committee's inquiry into prewar assessments regarding Iraq is without precedent in the Committee. Chairman Roberts's, Senator Roberts's, conclusion on the issue of intelligence manipulation is worth repeating:

"In the end, what the President used to make the extremely difficult decision to go to war was what he got from the intelligence community and not what he or Administration officials tried to make of it. The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence reviewed United States intelligence regarding the

number or existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, including the issue of bias, dissenting views, and how intelligence was disseminated and the linkages between Iraq and terrorist organizations. Again, no evidence of fixing intelligence surfaced.”

The Silberman-Robb Commission is seen as producing the definitive report on the issue of prewar intelligence on Iraq. This was a blue-ribbon, bipartisan commission supported by 88 bipartisan professionals and consultants. Its report runs over hundreds of pages and is nothing, if not thorough in its scope and depth of review. The commission concluded:

“After a thorough review, the Commission found no indication that the intelligence community distorted the evidence regarding Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction. What the intelligence professionals told you about Saddam Hussein’s programs was what they believed. They were simply wrong.

“Finally, we closely examined the possibility that intelligence analysts were pressured by policymakers to change their judgments about Iraq’s nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs. The analysts who worked Iraq’s weapons issues universally agreed that in no instance did political pressure cause them to skew or alter any of their analytical judgments.”

In reviewing the mountain of public evidence that refutes the notion of any fixing of intelligence, we should not ignore the obvious. There was no need for supporters of the war to fix intelligence on the run-up to the war because the prewar belief among the intelligence community and policymakers that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction was overwhelming. Both the Intelligence Committee and leaders of both political parties believed with certainty that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. For example, in 1998, President Clinton stated, and I quote:

“There should be no doubt Saddam’s ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world.”

National Security Adviser Sandy Berger remarked:

“Year after year, in conflict after conflict, Saddam has proven that he seeks weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, in order to use them.”

Senator John Kerry stated in 2003:

“I think Saddam Hussein’s weapons of mass destruction are a threat, and that is why I voted to hold him accountable and to make certain we disarm him.”

In 2004, when asked whether it was a fair statement that the Administration misled the American people, former weapons inspector David Kay responded:

“I think it is not fair, and it also trivializes what we did find and the problem we face. The problem we face is that before the war, not only the U.S. Administration and United States intelligence but the French, British, Germans, the UN, all thought Saddam had weapons of mass destruction.”

David Kay noted that "this view of Iraq was held during the Clinton Administration and did not change in the Bush Administration."

The British inquiry into prewar intelligence on Iraq rendered findings similar to those found in all of the United States reports. In his summary of conclusions, Lord Hutton dismissed the allegation that the British intelligence dossier supporting the use of force against Iraq was "sexed up."

"I consider that the allegation was unfounded, as it would have been understood by those who heard the broadcast to mean that the dossier had been embellished with intelligence known or believed to be false or unreliable, which was not the case."

That was a quote from Lord Hutton.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence recently announced its intention to complete its second phase of its investigation into the Bush Administration's use of prewar intelligence in Iraq. This second phase will focus on the question raised by H. Res. 505, the White House's presentation to the public of its case for Iraq, that is, how Bush Administration officials, including the White House Iraq Group, handled prewar intelligence, including whether the information was misrepresented in White House statements to the public.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has collected public statements of Bush Administration officials, as well as intelligence data available at the time. The senators will determine if such public statements were justified by the data.

Finally, Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald reportedly subpoenaed White House Iraq Group documents.

In light of all of these past and ongoing investigations into the Administration's use of prewar intelligence on Iraq, the House International Relations Committee need not insert itself into an intelligence issue best addressed by the Select Committees on Intelligence.

I urge you to vote with me to report H. Res. 505. I would like to point out that I have a litany of quotations from very prominent Democratic officials during the Clinton Administration, including the Secretary of State, the National Security Adviser, and others, all of them asserting as a fact that weapons of mass destruction were available to Saddam Hussein. Everybody believed it, that is what the intelligence showed, and that is what the previous Administration, as well as the Bush Administration, relied on.

So I think this is a political effort to embarrass the President. I do not care how we got into the war. That, we will have to argue until doomsday, but one thing I do know: We had better win. We had better not lose this war. We had better not get chased out of the Middle East, and if that happens, that will be a disaster. And I ask myself, does this effort here today help or hinder our ultimate victory and coming home from that part of the world? I hope that you will ask yourself that question, too.

Now, I turn to my friend, the Ranking Democratic Member, Mr. Lantos, for his remarks.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and before I offer my brief observations, I want to welcome to the Committee our distinguished colleague and my good friend, Congressman Kucinich, and his lovely wife from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, a number of issues have created doubt in the minds of many Americans as to whether their government has been straight with them, whether the government committed its sons and daughters to do battle on the basis of an honest analysis of the facts. That is a most regrettable development. Experience tells us it is difficult to win on the battlefield when the people lose confidence in their leaders.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, we live in a country where patriotic men and women can criticize their most senior officials in the most unrestrained fashion and do so with impunity.

I am also worried when some senior officials fail to take the necessary and appropriate actions to allay all of the concerns of all of their critics.

Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 505 presents the Administration with an opportunity to put to rest the charges that it exaggerated intelligence or misled the nation into war. It asks only that the Administration allow this body to examine the relevant documents of the White House Iraq Group. It asks only that the Administration cooperate in allowing Congress to do the oversight work that the proper functioning of our democracy requires.

Mr. Chairman, the courageous and extraordinary men and women carrying out the mission in Iraq are our constituents, and every Member of this body fully supports them. I have said it before, and I will say it again: We owe it to our soldiers and to all of our constituents to develop a complete picture of the decision-making and analysis that led the United States to go to war to bring down the regime of Saddam Hussein. And the Executive Branch owes it to the American people to make certain that their representatives are fully informed.

Mr. Chairman, I fully understand that the Administration does not welcome this resolution, but it should. This resolution offers the Administration a useful instrument to stem the decline in public trust. At a time when popular support for the war is diminishing, the refusal of the Executive Branch to do all it can to put skeptics' questions to rest only further undermines support. That is why I support this resolution, Mr. Chairman, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues across the aisle to do likewise. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Are there any amendments? Mr. Menendez.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I seek to strike the last word.

Chairman HYDE. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the ratification of our Constitution, the Congress has assumed the right and the obligation to oversee the Executive Branch. Recently, however, the Republican leadership has been disgraceful in its neglect of that obligation by virtually abdicating its right to oversight in order to protect its leaders in the White House, and the American people have paid the price.

This Administration led the country into an elective war on what we now know were false premises. We also know that the Adminis-

tration rushed into war, that there was minimal planning for the post-war era, and that we currently have no plan to win the peace. And as a result of this lack of planning, thousands of our young men and women have died and thousands more have been wounded. And we know that this effort to market and sell this to the American people was done by a working group in the White House which is the subject of this resolution.

But that is not all. A CIA operative has been compromised, her name allegedly leaked in retaliation for criticism of the Administration's weak justifications for the war by her husband; a member of the White House staff has now been indicted in the investigation related to that leak; and the President, who promised that none of his staff were involved in the leak and who clearly stated he would fire anyone who was involved, has still not followed through with his promise.

Let me be clear. There is no more sacred trust that we can give our President than the decision to go to war, the decision to send our young men and women into harm's way. As Members of Congress and as Americans, we must learn the true story behind this President's decision to take this country into an elective war and the leaking of the name of a CIA operative. This Committee should be ashamed that not one, but two, resolutions of inquiry requesting an independent investigation into the Valerie Plame case were voted down by the Republicans on a partisan basis; not one, but two, opportunities to learn the truth about who compromised the secret identity of a CIA officer and why have been squandered.

When 2,056 Americans have died so far and thousands more have been wounded, when this past October was declared the fourth-deadliest month in Iraq overall and the deadliest since January, when, on Monday, a suicide bomber plowed into an American check point and killed four American soldiers in the deadliest suicide bomber against Americans in more than 4 months, this Republican-led Congress has blindly signed check after check to this Administration without insisting on a timeline or a success strategy with verifiable and discernable benchmarks.

So I ask again, why has this Congress not fulfilled its obligation to exercise oversight over the Executive? It should not be a partisan issue. Learning the truth about the reasons behind this war should not depend on what side of the aisle you are on, supporting the troops by giving them clear benchmarks to define the strategy for success should not depend on what side of the aisle you sit on, and standing up for the men and women who risk their lives as covert agents around the world to protect the national security of the United States should certainly not depend on what side of the aisle you sit on.

So it is past time for Congress to take back its right to act as a check and balance against the Executive. It is past time for Congress to fulfill its obligation to the American people and demand information on the Iraq war and the leaking of the name of a CIA operative. It is past time for Congress to fulfill its responsibility to oversee the President and the Executive Branch.

In closing, I remind the Members of this Committee of what President Ford once said: "Truth is the glue that holds government together." The Republican leadership has already lost two opportu-

nities to do the right thing. We must not lose another one. I urge my colleagues to support the original bill.

Chairman HYDE. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Since the brutal terrorist attack of September 11th, the United States has responded with the policies that offer a pragmatic approach to the challenges that we face. These have included taking the fight to the terrorists and their supporters, denying them resources and sanctuary, keeping them on the run so that they cannot target us at home, all while simultaneously assisting the developing of the Middle East into a bastion of stable, free-market, democratic societies as a means of addressing the conditions that breed extremism and violence, and Iraq is at the crux of this effort.

Within this past year alone, the people of Iraq have not only held free elections, have approved a new Iraqi Constitution this past October, but they are diligently preparing for nationwide elections on December 15th. Today, the Iraqi people remain engaged in a political process aimed at creating a unified and a democratic Iraq, to the envy of neighboring countries such as Iran and Syria and to the chagrin of these tyrannical regimes. These terrorists understand the importance of Iraq for the immediate, short-term goals of the global war on terror and for the long-term preventative strategy to address the root causes of terrorism and Islamic extremism. The terrorists are doing everything in their power to destroy what has been accomplished in Iraq thus far. Americans serving in Iraq understand the critical nature of the United States effort in that country.

I am proud of my stepson's service in Iraq. He and his fiancee are flying F-18's right now in Iraq. Dougie and Lindsey understand their mission. We in the United States must also understand and value and respect their mission. Let us move forward, stop dwelling on the past, focus on the future, how we can join forces to support, to assist, to complement the excellent work that Americans of all backgrounds and, specifically, our men and women in uniform are performing in Iraq to ensure the success of their mission.

In the aftermath of September 11th, the words of former President Ronald Reagan echo stronger than ever: "As we did during the Cold War," he said, "you and I now have a rendezvous with destiny. If we fail," as President Reagan said, "at least let our children and our children's children say of us, we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done."

So let us commit ourselves to ensuring the success of our mission in Iraq, keep the terrorists on the run, deny them safe sanctuary, help spread freedom and democracy as an antidote to terror, to Islamic extremists, to violence, to incitement. Let us channel our energy toward the future, on what we seek to accomplish, and stop wasting our efforts on rehashing the past yet again. I ask my colleagues to vote to report this measure adversely. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Will the gentlelady yield to me?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes, sir.

Chairman HYDE. I have a couple of quotes I would like to advise the Committee of. Here is one: "He will use those weapons of mass destruction again, as he has 10 times since 1983." That was Sandy

Berger at a town hall meeting. That is in *USA Today*, February 19, 1998.

But here is a quote that you ought to enjoy:

“Saddam Hussein has been engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction technology which is a threat to countries in the region, and he has made a mockery of the weapons inspection process.”

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Who said that, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman HYDE. Just a minute. I will get to it. I have got another zinger here:

“The responsibility of the United States in this conflict is to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, minimize the danger to our troops, and diminish the suffering of the Iraqi people.”

That was from Nancy Pelosi.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. No.

Chairman HYDE. Yes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I cannot believe that.

Chairman HYDE. December 16, 1998.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am shocked.

Chairman HYDE. I also would point out to my friend from New Jersey, there are two Intelligence Committees on the Hill, one in the Senate and one in the House, and they are bipartisan, and both of them have done their job and are continuing to do their job. To say that we have waived our oversight responsibilities is absolute nonsense. I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you.

Mr. Delahunt?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the Chairman. I would like to begin with a quote, too, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. By all means.

Mr. DELAHUNT. “This Administration is seeing Congress as an enemy and a constitutional nuisance. The world right now is in trouble, and we need to have a Congress and a President and an Executive Branch that is working together.” That is from Senator Chuck Hagel from Nebraska, Mr. Chairman, in case you are interested.

You know, this resolution is about a very significant and important issue, but at a fundamental level, the topic is actually irrelevant because it is about us. It is about the Committee, and it is about the role of Congress. We face a choice today. We can fulfill our constitutional duty to conduct oversight of the Executive Branch, or we can continue to be a rubber stamp for the White House. We can serve the people of the United States, or we can serve the White House. That is the choice before us today.

We have not investigated how the Bush Administration used taxpayer dollars to sell a war that was a distraction from the real war, those that attacked us on 9/11. We have not examined the complete lack of planning for post-war Iraq, a lack of planning that has enabled the insurgency to kill more than three Americans daily. We have not examined how the White House’s handling of the war has destroyed our image in the world. It goes on and on and on. We

have not looked into the incredible corruption that is ongoing today in Iraq. One only has to read some statements and reports from those who are advocates for the war, the massive amount of corruption. We have failed in our responsibility.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is time for us to stand up and to do our job, and I will yield back.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Burton?

Mr. BURTON. I have high regard for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially the "Silver Fox from Massachusetts" who just spoke, but I do not see things quite the way my colleagues do. The implication is that the Administration lied, and that is why we went to war, but I can remember sitting on the Floor of the House in closed meetings with both Democrats and Republicans there where we were getting classified briefings, and it was very, very clear what the situation was.

After those classified briefings, I heard, with great strength in their voices, my Democratic colleagues, including the ones the Chairman mentioned, Sandy Berger and Nancy Pelosi, your leader, standing up and extolling the virtues of the Administration in taking this war to the enemy, to Saddam Hussein, and taking this war to the terrorists and the threat that it brought to the United States of America and how we had to do this.

I listened to those speeches, and I even applauded a lot of the Democrats' speeches. What I cannot figure out is where all of this selective memory loss came from because most of you that are talking today do not remember those speeches, do not remember how you were very forcefully in favor of sending our troops into Iraq to preserve freedom and democracy and eliminating the threat of terrorism. But you were doing it, and yet, today, you know, we hear that the President was misleading us, that everything was a pack of lies, and it just is not so.

I understand your desire to get back in a majority, and I understand that your conference, when you meet, the number one objective is not just to do the right thing here in Congress but to win this next election and get back in control, and I can understand that. You have been out of power for about 11 years, but do not distort the truth. The fact of the matter is Democrats and Republicans alike, based upon information that we received, intelligence data from around the world, led all of us to believe that the right thing to do was to go to war with Saddam Hussein and eliminate potential weapons of mass destruction. And let us not forget that Saddam Hussein used weapons of mass destruction against his own people, the Kurds—he killed thousands and thousands—and in the Iraq-Iran War, for 7 years, he used weapons of mass destruction.

So what were we to believe after we got intelligence reports, that he had changed his mind, that all of a sudden he had become clean after he had buried three or 400,000 people in mass graves and used weapons of mass destruction? Come on. I understand your desire to change the makeup of this place, but let us do it with facts, and let us not do it with innuendo that is not accurate.

Let me just say one more thing when you start talking about the Sandy Berger case. Sandy Berger was not indicted because he outed a CIA agent; he was indicted because he allegedly lied to a

grand jury, which is what Bill Clinton did when he was President, when he looked into the camera, and he said to the American people, Hey, I want to tell you folks something. I did not have sex with that woman, Ms. Lewinski.

Now, all I want to tell you is that the fact of the matter is that Mr. Libby—

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Burton, you did not mean Sandy Berger, did you? That is what you said.

Mr. BURTON. Bill Clinton.

Mr. LANTOS. No. You meant "Scooter" Libby.

Mr. BURTON. Excuse me. "Scooter" Libby. Sandy Berger was sticking papers in his sock and going outside of a library. I forgot about that. I must have had that confused. But the fact of the matter is "Scooter" Libby was not indicted for outing a CIA agent; he was indicted because he allegedly lied, and we still have innocence until proven guilty in this country.

So all I just want to say to my colleagues is that I have high regard for you on the other side of the aisle. I understand your desire to get back in the majority, but remember, it was a consolidated effort to send our troops to war based upon intelligence information that all of us believed was accurate and that there were weapons of mass destruction. I yield back.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Ackerman?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to get into where you stick your socks or anything like that, but it seems to me, in reading the resolution, that there is nothing there that embarrasses the President. The language is absolutely neutral. It just calls for us to gather information to find out what happened, and while it has been asserted here by some that they do not care what happened in the past to get us into the war, that it is just necessary that we win, I do not know that the two are mutually exclusive. I think we do have to win, and I think we also have to find out how we got into the war.

If you want to know my belief at this point, and I hope the President can clear it up, I think the President and those in his Administration lied. They lied to the American people, they lied to the Congress, they lied to this Committee, and I think that this is their opportunity, if they wish, to clear it up.

Mr. Lantos made clear that this is an opportunity for them unless there is really something that they want to hide and cover up, and this Committee has set as its task to whitewash those actions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Let me just finish, and I would be delighted.

I liken it to people sitting on a jury listening to the prosecutor present the evidence about the well-known s.o.b. who is in the dock, and he presents all kinds of evidence, and the jury, to a man and woman, sees the evidence and examines the evidence and hears the case as it is presented, and beyond a reasonable doubt decides that this guy is guilty and sets him out to hang, and they hang him, and the world does not miss him. But then it is suddenly discovered that the prosecutor rigged the evidence, that he had evidence that he did not present to the other side, that there were other opinions, that there was other reasoning, that there were other witnesses, that there was other evidence, that there

were other opinions that the case was otherwise than described and hid that information from the jury.

What do you do when you are on the jury after you have hung a guy who is a bad guy but maybe did not do what they indicated in the case that was presented? That is the dilemma with which we are faced. I am not one who is in favor of cutting and running. I think it would be a disaster if we did that, but I think the biggest disaster is if this Committee, which has never looked into it, this Committee has never looked into it, abdicates in its responsibility, then I do not know what this Committee is supposed to be doing.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ACKERMAN. The jury has been reassembled, and we demand to see all of the evidence. That is what this resolution says.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentleman yield for a question now?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. When you suggested that the President lied, just to clarify for all of us what you mean by that, are you saying that when the President of the United States made these statements, that he knew something that he was saying was wrong, was fallacious, and that he intentionally gave wrong information to the American people?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I believe that the President misled the American people from the day he spoke to the Congress—

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is not the question. Was it intentional?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Reclaiming my time, the President, in claiming that this was attributed to British intelligence; why the heck would some President attribute something to British intelligence when we have the best intelligence in the world? And that is because he knew what American intelligence indicated, that that story was full of holes from the very beginning, and he had sold it to us and to the American people. He misled the American people, and the quoting that was done from notable Democrats, if you will, that Saddam Hussein was engaged in pursuing a nuclear program and weapons of mass destruction, yes, that is true. He was, but it depends on what the meaning of "was" was because, grammatically, that is the pluperfect condition of the verb, and whether it is ongoing or not because everybody does know he was engaged, but that was in 1991 and maybe not in the next decade.

We do not know that, but this resolution gives us the opportunity to find out what the Administration knew and when they knew it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Rohrabacher?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I just would request to strike the last word. I think asking our colleagues to define what they mean when they use the word "lying" is not an unreasonable question, and I was dismayed that—I am sincerely trying to understand the points you are making.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Not until I get my point out. Okay?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I would rather answer your question on your time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have the time, do I not? When you refused to answer my question—

Mr. ACKERMAN. I am here. I am ready to answer. Here I am.

Chairman HYDE. The Chair would appreciate regular order.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am dismayed that when a direct question is asked, and a sincere question is asked about the meaning of what points are trying to be made here, that I got that kind of a brush-off, and I think that we deserve more, and the American people deserve more.

When it is a claim that the President of the United States lied, are we hearing today that the people on the other side of the aisle who are making this claim are suggesting the President knew that it was not true but went ahead and said it anyway? That is a far different thing than saying the President was mistaken because, as we have heard from Chairman Hyde, numerous, numerous people were saying exactly the same thing, and, in fact, George Tenet, who was the director of the CIA, was, at that time, reaffirming everything that the President said prior to the President's statement. That is his job. Having worked in the White House and having written Presidential statements, I can tell you that on things like this the director of the CIA has to have a check-off before that statement is made. George Tenet was not just a director of the CIA and a Republican appointee. He was, in fact, a Democrat appointee, and, in fact, he was not only a Democratic appointee, but as I pointed out in this Committee before, he was a Hill staffer, a Democrat Hill staffer, prior to getting that appointment.

So do not tell me, and I cannot believe that George Tenet was intentionally lying, and all of these other people were intentionally lying.

Chairman HYDE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I certainly would, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Senator Ted Kennedy, on September 27, 2002, said, and I quote, "We have known for many years that Saddam Hussein is seeking and developing weapons of mass destruction." Now, did he lie? Was he lying, or was he mistaken? Why attribute mistaken statements to lies, intentional deception, when they are done by a Republican, but when the Democrats, and I have got a litany here, when the Democrats do it, it is just a mistake?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is a very good point to make, Mr. Chairman. Just to reclaim my time, I would just say this, that—

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER [continuing]. I will in one moment—that I think that what we are seeing is, again—it is one thing for people to say, "We support the war effort," and then to do everything they can to try to destroy the American people's ability to withstand the pressures that come about with war.

We lose people in wartime, always. If we are going to achieve our objectives, it will cause a loss of life. But since day one, even people on the other side of the aisle who claim to have been supportive of this effort have been talking in defeatist terms or nitpicking or back biting in order to undermine the public support for the effort itself. I think that does a great disservice to our country in achieving these goals which my colleagues suggest they are supporting. I certainly will yield to my friend, Mr. Ackerman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you very much. There are many of us who have done nothing to undermine the effort. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who voted enthusiastically, and, like Ted Kennedy, I have to say I was on that jury, and he was on that jury, and the conclusions that he used to base his statements on, as we have, all of us have, were based on things that are, as likely as not, false, that were not telling the truth as you know it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Now, if you think that what you are saying is the truth, and it happens not to be, that is not a lie.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Are you saying the President was out of the loop?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. No. I am saying the President was misinformed perhaps. Perhaps our intelligence systems were wrong.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Well, let us get the s.o.b.'s who misinformed the President.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me ask the gentleman one question, and that is, is the gentleman saying that with what he knows now, he would oppose this war effort and leave Saddam Hussein in power?

Mr. ACKERMAN. With what I know now, that the Administration came to us with a stacked deck, lying, not telling the truth, and deceiving us,—

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is not answering my question.

Mr. ACKERMAN [continuing]. I would vote differently.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Again, you are—my question.

Mr. ACKERMAN. If the Administration came to us honestly and made the case that he was a bad guy, I might just vote—

Chairman HYDE. Will the gentleman observe order, please? If we are going to have a hearing, we have to follow some decent procedures.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman. The fact is I, again, did not get an answer to the question in an honest discussion.

Chairman HYDE. The gentleman's time has long since expired, and certainly his antagonist has long since expired.

Mr. Payne of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. A calming factor, I think, in this discussion.

Let me say, though, that I certainly strongly support H. Res. 505. I urge my colleagues to support it. I commend my good friend and colleague, Mr. Kucinich, for introducing it. And I certainly was not with many of those quotes that were given. Thank God, I was one that did not believe that there were weapons of mass destruction in the first place and wondered how so many of my colleagues and friends that I respect so greatly did.

As you may recall, I was privileged to lead the debate against allowing the President to have preemptive-strike, Congress giving away its power to the President to use as he saw fit. I was the, I guess, ranking Democrat at that time who opposed the war vehemently from the inception; and, therefore, as I indicated, had the privilege for 2 days, from 12 noon to midnight on Wednesday and 12 noon to midnight on Thursday, to lead the debate. So, in my own history, I will go down in history because I think it was one of the most important opportunities that I have had in my political career by far.

One of the reasons was that, at that time, Saddam Hussein said that the UN inspectors, led by Hans Blitz, could go anywhere. He prevented them for months and months, but then, knowing that he had no weapons of mass destruction and had put the big bluff on the world and many of our leaders, he finally said, well, you know, the bluff is over; let them come in because there were no weapons of mass destruction or chemical or biological weapons. The last chemical or biological weapons he had were given to him by the U.S. that he then used against the Kurds. They found some old, rusty canisters and thought they were onto something, but that was nothing.

So that group in the White House, made up of White House Chief of Staff Andy Card, Senior Adviser Karl Rove, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs Karen Hughes, Cheney's former chief of staff "Scooter" Libby, Mary Matalin, Nicolas Calio, and James Wilkinson made up a group called "the WHIG."

It is very interesting, to go back in history, the Whig Party did not depend on England. As a matter of fact, the Whig Party opposed England, went to war against England, so there was no co-operation between the old Whig Party in our history and England. But the interesting thing, too, is that the Whig Party had an interest in the Constitution. they felt that the Constitution should be loosely interpreted.

I had the privilege to teach history for many years in the Newark Public School System, and the Whig Party felt that the Constitution was not for strict constructionism. So what we have seen is our Constitution sort of manipulated by the House, ourselves, giving the President the right to do something that we should have the right to do. It made no sense to give the President the opportunity to decide when he wanted to use that authority to go to war: Over 2,000 United States troops dead; 30,000 to 50,000 Iraqis and maybe more; Valerie Plame exposed; Ambassador Joe Wilson, a great diplomat with long service for the United States of America, embarrassed.

Because let me tell you, in foreign countries, when Ambassadors go and meet with their counterparts or Presidents of those countries or leaders, they have informal meetings, and these countries know that somewhere in the U.S. Embassy there is a CIA person somewhere down the line, usually the guy who has got those straight eyes that just move left to right, but they do not really expect that the spouse of an Ambassador, where they are having some wine over dinner, informal chat.

So this whole thing is much more damaging than we think, this Valerie Plame incident, where today foreign leaders and dignitaries in their countries, when the U.S. Ambassador comes,—they are probably not even invited as much as they used to be to informal events—there is the suspicion that every Ambassador's spouse may be a CIA operative; it has done irreparable damage to our country.

Chairman HYDE. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I urge support of H. Res. 505. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Paul of Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LANTOS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. State your inquiry.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, in about 10 minutes, we will have three votes, and all Members would like to plan their schedule. What is your pleasure in terms of setting a time for the vote on this matter?

Chairman HYDE. Well, when they call the votes, I will make a motion—I will not make a motion—I will announce—that we will recess, and we will resume following the votes and a reasonable time for luncheon. So I will not know when that is until they call the votes, unless we can dispose of this before we are called to vote. That would be the ultimate. So let us try that anyway.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Paul.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the years between 2000 and 2004, there were a lot of votes on the House Floor, and I think, during that time, I voted by myself 126 times, and that was twice as many times as everybody else put together. I am neither proud of that nor ashamed of it. It is just the way it is, but, nevertheless, with that experience, you would think it would always be easy for me to make my votes, but, quite frankly, this is a difficult vote for me, for obvious reasons.

One of the problems is there has been such rare support for the traditional American foreign policy of nonintervention. I still believe there are merits in the argument of nonentangling alliances that we were advised to follow, that it is a wise policy not to get involved in nation building. So it is the absence of support for that that makes it more difficult for me and puts me sort of in the middle of what is happening here today.

I do believe the American people deserve to know all of the answers possible. I think, quite frankly, what we are asking for today is very little, and it is very late. If you think about it, this is exactly the debate that should have been occurring in 2002, being we went to war, and now it is a little bit late. And sometimes I think there are some who are involved that are disingenuous in their demands now for this information all of a sudden when, as was pointed out by our Chairman, there was a lot of support for this war from the opposition party, and all of a sudden, now it looks like maybe the President can be embarrassed, and there can be some political gain, not that either side is exempt from politicizing this, but I think that the Republicans, as a matter of fact, have been more consistent on this. They supported the war. They wanted the war. They want to continue the war, and they are putting the best light on it, and I think they are more consistent.

I think the other side got into war. It was said the President took us to war. The President did take us to war, but who is supposed to take us to war? The Congress is supposed to take us to war. Whose responsibility is that? It is the Congress. We reneged on our responsibility, and now we would like to go back, and this was one of my arguments in 2002, is we want the President to make the decision because if it goes badly, we can jump on the President.

So I see that as being disingenuous. I think, though, it is very important to point out that the author of this amendment cannot be included in that because he happens to have taken a stand with the other Administration that is exactly the same, being antiwar

and going cautiously. So not everybody is in that category. But now we are looking for excuses and blame, blame the President and not ourselves if we reneged on our responsibility on making a decision when to go to war.

It has been pointed out rather clearly by the Chairman these strong statements by the opposition party for the war, which is true, but these statements are meant to reassure us that it was condoned by both parties. From my viewpoint, it does not reassure me. That is my concern, that both sides march off to war without thinking. Then they look for scapegoats, and then they politicize the issue. That is where our problem is.

I think that what we need to do is stop and start addressing the foreign policy overall. When you think about it, the whole scheme to go to war against Iraq was established in 1998 with the other party in charge, the Iraq Liberation Act, regime change, and what are we doing now? I will bet you a majority of both sides of this aisle right now are supporting the same kind of policy, to march for regime change in Iraq and Iran, because they are not questioning that. We do not change this policy. We are doing exactly the same thing.

So I think it is time that we reassessed all of this policy and decide our responsibility, as Members of Congress, and quit playing this political blame game and saying that, boy, if we could only embarrass the President and politicize this without dealing with the real issue of what is best for America. Right now, I believe it is best for America to know why and how we went to war. The question was asked, how did we go to war? We know exactly how we went to war, because the government let the Executive Branch of government decide when we would go to war, totally ignoring our responsibility and the law of the land.

So my strong suggestion is there is nothing wrong with the traditional American foreign policy of nonintervention, staying out of the internal affairs of other nations. Do not get involved in entangling alliances, and we, on our side, should condemn nation building just as we did when the previous Administration got involved in nation building, and we ran on that slogan.

So I think it is time for us to be really honest with ourselves and decide what is best for this country. It is for that reason I will support H. Res. 505.

Chairman HYDE. The question occurs on ordering the previous question. All in favor, say "aye."

[A chorus of ayes.]

Chairman HYDE. Opposed, "nay."

[A chorus of noes.]

Chairman HYDE. I kind of think the ayes have it. Okay. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Leach?

Mr. LEACH. No.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Leach votes no. Mr. Smith of New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Smith of New Jersey votes yes. Mr. Burton?

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Burton votes yes. Mr. Gallegly?

Mr. GALLEGLY. Aye.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gallegly votes yes. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen votes yes. Mr. Rohrabacher?  
Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Rohrabacher votes yes. Mr. Royce?  
Mr. ROYCE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Royce votes yes. Mr. King?  
Mr. KING. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. King votes yes. Mr. Chabot?  
Mr. CHABOT. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Chabot votes yes. Mr. Tancredo?  
Mr. TANCREDO. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Tancredo votes yes. Mr. Paul?  
Mr. PAUL. Pass.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Paul passes. Mr. Issa?  
Mr. ISSA. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Issa votes yes. Mr. Flake?  
Mr. FLAKE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Flake votes yes. Mrs. Davis?  
Mrs. DAVIS. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mrs. Davis votes yes. Mr. Green?  
Mr. GREEN. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Green votes yes. Mr. Weller?  
Mr. WELLER. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Weller votes yes. Mr. Pence?  
Mr. PENCE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Pence votes yes. Mr. McCotter?  
Mr. MCCOTTER. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. McCotter votes yes. Ms. Harris?  
Ms. HARRIS. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Harris votes yes. Mr. Wilson?  
Mr. WILSON. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wilson votes yes. Mr. Boozman?  
Mr. BOOZMAN. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Boozman votes yes. Mr. Barrett?  
Mr. BARRETT. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Barrett votes yes. Mr. Mack?  
Mr. MACK. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Mack votes yes. Mr. Fortenberry?  
Mr. FORTENBERRY. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Fortenberry votes yes. Mr. McCaul?  
Mr. McCaul. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. McCaul votes yes. Mr. Poe?  
Mr. POE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Poe votes yes. Mr. Lantos?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Berman?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman?  
Mr. ACKERMAN. Pass.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman passes. Mr. Faleomavaega?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne?  
Mr. PAYNE. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne votes no. Mr. Menendez?

[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Brown?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Sherman?  
Mr. SHERMAN. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Sherman votes no. Mr. Wexler?  
Mr. WEXLER. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wexler votes no. Mr. Engel?  
Mr. ENGEL. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Engel votes no. Mr. Delahunt?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Meeks?  
Mr. MEEKS. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Meeks votes no. Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Lee votes no. Mr. Crowley?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Blumenauer?  
Mr. BLUMENAUER. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Blumenauer votes no. Ms. Berkley?  
Ms. BERKLEY. Heck no.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Berkley votes no. Ms. Napolitano?  
Ms. NAPOLITANO. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Napolitano votes no. Mr. Schiff?  
Mr. SCHIFF. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Schiff votes no. Ms. Watson?  
Ms. WATSON. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Watson votes no. Mr. Smith of Washington?  
Mr. SMITH OF WASHINGTON. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Smith of Washington votes no. Ms. McCollum?  
Ms. MCCOLLUM. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. McCollum votes no. Mr. Chandler?  
Mr. CHANDLER. Pass.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Chandler passes. Mr. Cardoza?  
Mr. CARDOZA. Pass.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Cardoza passes. Chairman Hyde?  
Chairman HYDE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Chairman Hyde votes yes.  
Chairman HYDE. The clerk will report.  
Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?  
Chairman HYDE. How is the gentleman from New York, Mr. Ackerman, recorded?  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Menendez did not vote.  
Mr. MENENDEZ. And what is this vote on, just to make sure.  
Chairman HYDE. Just a moment, please.  
Mr. MENENDEZ. What is this vote on?  
Chairman HYDE. Mr. Lantos?  
Mr. LANTOS. No.  
Chairman HYDE. Anybody else wish to vote?  
Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary. What is the vote on before the Committee?  
Chairman HYDE. The vote is on the previous question.  
Mr. MENENDEZ. The answer is no.  
Chairman HYDE. Mr. Meeks, are you recorded?

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Meeks voted no.

Mr. MEEKS. I voted no. What is this, trying to silence people? Are you getting nervous here?

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Brown?

[No response.]

Chairman HYDE. Are there any further votes?

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. ACKERMAN. How am I recorded?

Chairman HYDE. How is Mr. Ackerman recorded?

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman passed.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I will make that an absolute no, a heck no.

Chairman HYDE. Yes, sir? Did the clerk get the gentleman's vote?

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Cardoza votes no.

Chairman HYDE. All right. The clerk will report.

Ms. RUSH. On this vote, there are 25 yeses and 19 noes.

Chairman HYDE. The previous question is ordered, and the question occurs on the motion to report the resolution adversely. All in favor, say "aye."

[A chorus of ayes.]

Chairman HYDE. Opposed, "no."

[A chorus of noes.]

Mr. LANTOS. I request a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Your request will be granted. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Leach?

Mr. LEACH. No.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Leach votes no. Mr. Smith of New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Smith of New Jersey votes yes. Mr. Burton?

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Burton votes yes. Mr. Gallegly?

Mr. GALLEGLY. Aye.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gallegly votes yes. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen votes yes. Mr. Rohrabacher?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Rohrabacher votes yes. Mr. Royce?

Mr. ROYCE. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Royce votes yes. Mr. King?

[No response.]

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Chabot?

Mr. CHABOT. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Chabot votes yes. Mr. Tancredo?

Mr. TANCREDO. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Tancredo votes yes. Mr. Paul?

Mr. PAUL. No.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Paul votes no. Mr. Issa?

[No response.]

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Flake?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Flake votes yes. Mrs. Davis?

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mrs. Davis votes yes. Mr. Green?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Green votes yes. Mr. Weller?  
Mr. WELLER. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Weller votes yes. Mr. Pence?  
Mr. PENCE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Pence votes yes. Mr. McCotter?  
Mr. MCCOTTER. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. McCotter votes yes. Ms. Harris?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wilson?  
Mr. WILSON. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wilson votes yes. Mr. Boozman?  
Mr. BOOZMAN. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Boozman votes yes. Mr. Barrett?  
Mr. BARRETT. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Barrett votes yes. Mr. Mack?  
Mr. MACK. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Mack votes yes. Mr. Fortenberry?  
Mr. FORTENBERRY. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Fortenberry votes yes. Mr. McCaul?  
Mr. McCaul. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. McCaul votes yes. Mr. Poe?  
Mr. POE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Poe votes yes. Mr. Issa?  
Mr. ISSA. Heck yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Issa votes yes. Mr. Lantos?  
Mr. LANTOS. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Lantos votes no. Mr. Berman?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman?  
Mr. ACKERMAN. Pass.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Faleomavaega?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne?  
Mr. PAYNE. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne votes no. Mr. Menendez?  
Mr. MENENDEZ. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Menendez votes no. Mr. Brown?  
Mr. BROWN. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Brown votes no. Mr. Sherman?  
Mr. SHERMAN. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Sherman votes no. Mr. Wexler?  
Mr. WEXLER. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wexler votes no. Mr. Engel?  
Mr. ENGEL. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Engel votes no. Mr. Delahunt?  
Mr. DELAHUNT. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Delahunt votes no. Mr. Meeks?  
Mr. MEEKS. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Meeks votes no. Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Lee votes no. Mr. Crowley?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Blumenauer?  
Mr. BLUMENAUER. No.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Blumenauer votes no. Ms. Berkley?  
Ms. BERKLEY. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Berkley votes no. Ms. Napolitano?  
Ms. NAPOLITANO. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Napolitano votes no. Mr. Schiff?  
Mr. SCHIFF. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Schiff votes no. Ms. Watson?  
Ms. WATSON. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Watson votes no. Mr. Smith of Washington?  
Mr. SMITH OF WASHINGTON. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Smith of Washington votes no. Ms. McCollum?  
Ms. MCCOLLUM. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. McCollum votes no. Mr. Chandler?  
Mr. CHANDLER. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Chandler votes no. Mr. Cardoza?  
Mr. CARDOZA. No.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Cardoza votes no. Chairman Hyde?  
Chairman HYDE. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Chairman Hyde votes yes.  
Chairman HYDE. Mr. King? Mr. King?  
Mr. KING [continuing]. Votes yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. King votes yes.  
Chairman HYDE. Mr. Crowley?  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Crowley?  
[No response.]  
Ms. RUSH. Ms. Harris?  
Ms. HARRIS. Yes.  
Ms. RUSH. Votes yes.  
Chairman HYDE. The clerk will report.  
Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?  
Chairman HYDE. Mr. Ackerman wants to know how he is recorded.  
Ms. RUSH. He passed.  
Mr. ACKERMAN. I am voting no.  
Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman votes no.  
Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman HYDE. Yes.  
Mr. DELAHUNT. How am I recorded?  
Chairman HYDE. Who is asking? Mr. Delahunt?  
Ms. RUSH. He voted no.  
Chairman HYDE. The clerk will report.  
Ms. RUSH. On this vote, there are 25 yeses and 23 noes.  
Chairman HYDE. The ayes have it. The motion reported adversely is adopted.  
Without objection, the staff is directed to make any technical and conforming changes. The Committee stands adjourned.  
[Whereupon, at 11:57 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

